

**Excerpt from the  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Minneapolis Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED)**

250 South Fourth Street, Room 300  
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1385  
(612) 673-3710 Phone  
(612) 673-2526 Fax  
(612) 673-2157 TDD

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

DATE: March 21, 2013

TO: Zoning and Planning Committee

FROM: Jason Wittenberg, Manager, Community Planning & Economic Development – Land Use, Design and Preservation

SUBJECT: Planning Commission decisions of February 19, 2013

---

The following actions were taken by the Planning Commission on February 19, 2013. As you know, the Planning Commission's decisions on items other than rezonings, text amendments, vacations, 40 Acre studies and comprehensive plan amendments are final subject to a ten calendar day appeal period before permits can be issued.

Commissioners present: Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh, Kronzer, Luepke-Pier, Schiff and Tucker - 7

Not present: Wielinski (excused)

Committee Clerk: Lisa Baldwin (612) 673-3710

---

**5. The Broadway (BZZ-5913, Ward: 1) 945 Broadway St NE; 1120 Tyler St NE; 1121 Central Ave NE (Aly Pennucci).**

**A. Rezoning:** Application by Melissa Gorman, on behalf of First & First, LLC, has submitted a rezoning petition to change the zoning classification for the properties located at 945 Broadway St NE, 1120 Tyler St NE and 1121 Central Ave NE, to add the IL Industrial Living Overlay District to the I2 Medium Industrial District to allow for more flexibility in uses at this location.

**Action:** The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the findings and **approve** the rezoning petition to add the IL Industrial Living Overlay District to the existing I2 Medium Industrial District for the properties located at 945 Broadway St NE, 1120 Tyler St NE, and 1121 Central Ave NE.

**Approved on consent 5-0;** Schiff not present for the vote

**Absent:** Wielinski

**7. Zoning Code Text Amendment (Wards: 6 and 7) (Aly Pennucci).**

**A. Text Amendment:** Amending Title 20 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances related to the Zoning Code, as follows:

Amending Chapter 551 related to the Zoning Code: *Overlay Districts*

The purpose of the amendment is to revise the regulations related to parking lots in the Nicollet Franklin area Pedestrian Oriented Overlay District.

**Action:** The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the findings and **approve** the zoning code text amendment, amending chapter 551.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh, Kronzer, Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**Absent:** Wielinski

Staff Pennucci presented the staff report.

**Commissioner Kronzer:** I brought up the idea of not prohibiting shared principal parking lots. Is that something that staff has considered?

**Staff Pennucci:** Yes, that is something we have discussed a bit. In the idea that a surface parking lot provides a negative on the pedestrian oriented nature of the district, I guess our feeling was more that it would be better to encourage the neighborhood and businesses and developers to work together to come up with a shared parking agreement that is part of a structured parking or part of a larger development rather than a surface parking lot. I did acknowledge in the staff report that this will prohibit that as an option in the future. I think that where we have seen other...at least the one example I know of where there is an existing surface parking lot that's shared in the LynLake area, I understand the long-term goal there was to build a structured parking lot. My understanding from the neighborhood is they would rather see a built out site with a shared parking ramp rather than a surface lot.

**Commissioner Kronzer:** In an ideal world I understand that. Can you remind me how many principal parking lots have been approved since this PO has been in place?

**Staff Pennucci:** From what I understand, there are two principal parking lots that have been approved as interim parking lots; one at 27<sup>th</sup> and Nicollet and one at 24<sup>th</sup> and Nicollet. There are a couple long standing principal parking lots that were established prior to the adoption of the PO closer to downtown that are existing that would become nonconforming.

**Commissioner Kronzer:** When was the PO introduced or approved?

**Staff Pennucci:** I believe it was adopted in this area in 2007.

President Tucker opened the public hearing.

**Marian Biehn:** I'm the Executive Director for Whittier Alliance. Of the four modifications, the primary one that the neighborhood has been interested in seeing adopted is the increase in landscape percentage. That was an element that we initially introduced in the original pedestrian overlay. It has been adopted in our non-binding commercial guidelines, but we would like to see them applied to substantial rehabs and new development as things move forward. Nicollet Ave is going to be developing at a more rapid pace as the transit options are pursued. The greening of Nicollet Ave

would be an asset from a basic pedestrian experience as well as the added beautification, the environmental assets and just kind of reducing the impacts of vehicular circulation. I have submitted the ways that the Comprehensive Plan support the additional landscaping requests. If 20% is currently the minimum, it's an additional 10% which is pretty minimal in a large scale development. I suggested some language. It's not my area of expertise obviously, but there are a couple of ways it could be addressed – either maintaining the 20% minimum with a 10% increase in landscape requirement within the pedestrian overlay district or increasing the minimum to 30% in the pedestrian overlay district. This is something I'd like to either see worked out there today or perhaps directed back to staff to work with the neighborhood in developing the appropriate language. The Council Member is in support of the additional 10% here. The reduced street frontage of all the current surface lots along Nicollet Ave accounts for about two curb cuts per block. Those are existing and things are probably not going to change unless there is a substantial rehab or redevelopment. All the yellow are surface lots. Reducing the curb cut would enhance the pedestrian experience and protect the pedestrian. It's a reduction of 20 feet so it still allows easy car access. The inclusion of the language concerning the application of the intent of the overlay or the overlay in the presumed opening of Nicollet Ave - we know there are discussion with developers and we don't want to see the acquisition of land and an award of development rights without having these guidelines applied to the potential proposals that will come forward in that area and they will be substantial proposals so any way that we can guide that development to be consistent with the rest of Nicollet Ave would be our preference. I understand that it's overreaching what can be done right now but it should become part of the record.

**President Tucker:** So you're looking for that comment to go forward rather than that language to go in the text amendment.

**Marian Biehn:** Correct. We support what the staff has recommended. The difference between the 50% and 0% parking is residentially based. Our board preferred to have it at 50% because there has been an overflow of parking going into the residential areas, particularly with the recent addition of the ice house development. It was a board decision to put the minimum at a 50% reduction that read them at zero. There are other options. It might be something that could be conditioned.

**President Tucker:** Are these points listed in order of priority?

**Marian Biehn:** No, they are all number one.

President Tucker closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner Huynh:** I'd like to move staff recommendation for the text amendment (Luepke-Pier seconded). I think what staff has proposed here is moving the city in the right direction. I think the intent is to really become more of a sustainable city. I think with reducing surface parking lots that really are detrimental to the pedestrian environment and also allow for a lot more creativity with businesses to figure out how to handle parking, but also allowing for more pedestrians to have the priority in this area meets the intent of the city and I'm fully supportive.

**Commissioner Luepke-Pier:** I agree with the Whittier neighborhood in terms of increasing the percentage of landscape requirement. For all pedestrian oriented overlay districts, maybe we should look at this increase in landscaping. The only point of disagreement I have with this is really number seven in the text amendment in regard to elimination of off-street parking; I'm inclined to agree with the neighborhood on this one only because I think decreasing it to 50% still incents businesses to

invest in structured shared parking whereas if we had little to no requirement there's very little incentive for them to make an investment that's needed to actually have structured parking going forward.

**Commissioner Schiff:** I'm going to vote to send this forward today, but I will continue to work with Council Member Lilligren, the author of this, to take any additional feedback that comes from the neighborhood and businesses before the council votes on this.

**Commissioner Kronzer:** I will vote for this but want to share a concern I have. The shared parking strategy is the right thing to do on Nicollet Ave. I worry we're taking away a tool and taking away the flexibility of the commission by completely prohibiting interim parking lots. It will reduce flexibility moving forward. The urban pattern will allow a pattern of building, parking lot, building, parking lot, building, parking lot down Nicollet Ave where allowing a tool to provide a principal parking lot could provide building, building, building, building, parking lot, building, building, building. It's a concern of mine. I would like to put the rest of this in place and then wait a year to see how we're doing. It's really more of a comment at this point.

**Commissioner Luepke-Pier:** I was wondering if my fellow commissioners could lend their opinion on the elimination of off-street parking altogether versus the 50%.

**Commissioner Kronzer:** I support the 0% because it does support the smaller businesses. I think you'll see the larger redevelopments not having an issue because they will provide parking, but I think the smaller businesses would benefit.

**President Tucker:** I agree that starts to move us toward a model of people providing the parking they need rather than what is required by the city. I agree with staff about the landscaping. I think that's more appropriate for a general review of site plan standards because there are many other pedestrian overlay districts that might also benefit from a change in landscape standards. Any further discussion?

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh, Kronzer, Luepke-Pier and Schiff.

**Absent:** Wielinski